COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

This volume prescribes procedures for Air Transportation quality assurance implementation, maintenance, and guidance for all AMC aerial ports and air terminals. It is to be used in unison with AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program,* AMCI 24-101, Volume 22, *Training Requirements for Aerial Port Operations,* AMCI 20-1, *Logistics Standardization and Evaluation Program* and AFRCI 24-101, *Reserve Aerial Port Program.*

Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with AFMAN 37-123 (will convert to AFMAN 33-363), *Management of Records*, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located at **https:// afrims.amc.af.mil/**. Use AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*, to send comments and suggested improvements for this instruction through channels to HQ AMC/A4T, 402 Scott Drive, Unit 2A2, Scott AFB IL 62225-5308.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This document has been substantially revised and must be completely reviewed. Major changes include: Changes have been made to align this instruction with the Logistics Standardization and Evaluation Program (LSEP) in regards to terminology and rating criteria, creating one common core quality assurance language for the logistics community. Establishes the Command Performance Standard (CPS) as a command directed task compliance and/or performance checklist used to clarify or establish standards for air transportation tasks not appropriate to include in a QTP or any volume of instruction. This instruction also formalizes the utilization of the ATSEV Quality Assurance database to record, report, analyze and manage critical and basic process evaluations.

1. ATSEV Quality Assurance (QA)

1.1. **General Concepts.** Air transportation quality and reliability is the responsibility of all air transportation personnel. The combined efforts of quality assurance personnel, air transportation leaders, and specialist are necessary to ensure high quality process performance and reliability. Air transportation leaders are responsible for safety of flight, safety of equipment operation, and quality process performance. The ATSEV staff evaluates the quality of air transportation process and task performance within the air transportation organization and performs necessary functions to manage the organization's Quality Assurance program - Air Transportation Standardization Evaluation (ATSEV). The ATSEV program provides an objective sampling of both the quality of processes and the qualifications of air transportation personnel. The ATSEV staff serves as the primary technical advisory agency in the air transportation organization, helping supervisors and commanders resolve quality problems. The evaluation and analysis of deficiencies and problem areas are key functions of quality assurance. This activity identifies underlying causes of poor quality in air transportation processes. By finding causes of problems and recommending corrective actions to supervisors, ATSEV personnel can significantly affect the quality of air transportation processes within the air transportation organization. The qualities of air transportation processes and personnel proficiency are validated through the ATSEV program and shall be recorded using the ATSEV quality assurance database managed by HQ AMC/A4TX. Contracted organizations shall use the accepted quality program outlined in their respective contract.

1.1.1. **Purpose.** The purpose of ATSEV QA is to provide AMC/A4T and unit commanders with an assessment of a unit's ability to perform key air transportation processes ensuring standardized, repeatable, technically compliant process execution, while promoting a culture of professional excellence and personal responsibility.

1.1.2. **Objective.** ATSEV QA establishes standardized training and provides the tools to train and evaluate air transportation personnel and processes to one AMC standard.

Specific program objectives are to:

1.1.2.1. Ensure standardized duty position qualification training and performance.

1.1.2.2. Assess air transportation personnel qualifications and capabilities.

1.1.2.3. Comply with appropriate operational, training, and administrative directives.

1.1.2.4. Identify trends and recommend actions.

1.1.3. **Applicability.** Requirements outlined in this publication apply to active 2T2X1 and civilian equivalent personnel assigned to AMC units. It also applies to Air Reserve Component (ARC) units unless otherwise noted.

2. Responsibilities.

2.1. **HQ AMC/A4TX will:**

2.1.1. Establish policy and administration in coordination with HQ NGB/A4RD and HQ AFRC/A4T.

2.1.2. Maintain an ATSEV Quality Assurance web page and post required items as needed. **https://private.amc.af.mil/A4/asp/index.aspx?dd=/A4/a4dir/a4t/a4tr/atsev/&ti=HQ+AMC/A4TR+ATSEV&mn=atsev**. Maintain an ATSEV Quality Assurance Community of Practice

(CoP) web page. This web page will be used for online collaborative efforts addressing ATSEV issues such as QTP reviews and enable units to share their information, knowledge, expertise and exchange ideas that support the goal of ensuring the effectiveness and relevance of AMCs ATSEV Quality Assurance program in Aerial Port Transportation Operations and transformation. **https://afkm.wpafb.af.mil/ASPs/CoP/EntryCoP.asp?Filter=OO-LG-AM-15**

2.1.3. Monitor and review subordinate programs.

2.1.4. In response to trend data or when otherwise required, the AMC/A4T staff may establish Air Transportation Interest Items (ATIIs) for active duty units.

2.1.5. Ensure coordination of new/revised QTP's with HQ NGB/A4RD, HQ AFRC/A4T, and field units as deemed necessary.

2.1.6. Forward policy/guidance changes to the USAF EC/MOS/MOOT and request review of applicable QTP's.

2.1.6.1. If notified by the USAF EC/MOS/MOOT the changes made to a QTP/WBT require unit re-training, coordinate with affected units to determine the appropriate level and time frame for task re-training completion.

2.1.7. As required host an ATSEV QA workshop. Workshop maybe held in conjunction with the UTM workshop.

2.1.8. Ensure unit responses to ATIIs are reviewed and ensure unit compliance when applicable.

2.1.9. Maintain an automated air transportation quality assurance system to manage and track evaluation findings within the command.

2.1.9.1. Review active duty unit database metric/trend data and make recommendations through the publication of an ATII or other communications.

2.1.9.2. Brief A4T the results of units' evaluations.

2.2. **USAF EC/MOS/MOOT will:**

2.2.1. Develop and maintain all air transportation duty position task training materials and performance standards in consolidated QTP's. Submit request for subject matter experts through HQ AMC/A4TX, when needed.

2.2.1.1. Annually review and validate all QTP's and Web Based Training (WBT) courseware to ensure accuracy and cohesiveness; ensure the most current versions are available to HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.2.1.2. Develop and maintain an automated test bank of questions for use during Training Assessments (TAs).

2.2.2. Maintain WBT courseware and coordinate to ensure its contracted distance learning support agencies are providing customer service and a properly functioning AMC Distributed Learning Service (DLS) system. **https://amc.csd.disa.mil/kc/login/login.asp**

2.2.2.1. Validate each QTP and WBT lesson plan. Determine appropriate level of learning. Determine the need for a TA and validate or rescind from the QTP as appropriate. Forward suggested revisions to HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.2.2.2. Advise AMC/A4TX if changes to the QTPs/WBTs require individuals to re-train.

2.2.2.3. Ensure seasoned transportation personnel are selected to serve as Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) for both initial and revision levels of Instructional Systems Development (ISD).

2.3. **NGB/A4RD will:**

2.3.1. Monitor and review subordinate programs.

2.3.2. Recommend program policy and administrative changes to HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.3.3. Review unit recommendations/changes to the ATSEV program and forward to HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.3.4. Review the unit-level ATSEV training program for compliance during SAVs. Utilize the ARC ATSEV QA Management Checklist. (**Attachment 3**)

2.3.5. Review QTP's and TAs when received and forward recommended changes to HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.3.6. Establish ATIIs based on current trend data or in conjunction with HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.4. **HQ AFRC/A4T will:**

2.4.1. Monitor and review subordinate programs.

2.4.2. Recommend program policy and administrative changes to HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.4.3. Review unit recommendations/changes to the ATSEV program and forward to HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.4.4. At a minimum ensure NAFs review unit ATSEV programs during each SAV.

2.4.5. Review QTP's and TAs when received and forward recommended changes to HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.4.6. Establish AFRC/A4T ATIIs.

2.5. **AFRC NAF/A4T will:**

2.5.1. Review the unit-level ATSEV program for compliance during SAVs.

2.5.2. Review unit recommendations/changes to the ATSEV program and forward to HQ AFRC/A4T.

2.5.3. Review unit responses to ATIIs and ensure unit compliance when applicable.

2.6. **715/721 AMOG will:**

2.6.1. Review the unit metric/trend data for all assigned units and make recommendations as needed.

2.6.2. Review unit responses to ATIIs and ensure compliance.

2.6.3. Review unique unit operational procedures/guidance and make recommendations as needed.

2.6.4. Recommend program policy and administrative changes to HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.7. **Unit commanders will:**

2.7.1. Ensure prioritized training in accordance with (IAW) AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program.*

2.7.2. Establish an ATSEV QA function.

2.7.2.1. If determined operationally more effective, commanders may delegate ATSEV to the aerial port flight. If so delegated, this does not alleviate the requirement to brief the commander on all metrics, trend, and training data as directed in this volume. If not delegated, all requirements will be accomplished by the commander.

2.7.3. Designate, in writing, a full-time ATSEV manager and full-time evaluators. Appointment letters must specify the primary area(s) the manager and evaluators are assigned to evaluate (**Attachment 4**). ARC commanders will designate in writing a manager and evaluators. Appointment letters will be maintained in the ATSEV QA office station files. A copy must also be provided to HQ AMC/A4TX ATSEV QA Program Manager.

2.7.4. Maintain a list of former evaluators and recall them on a temporary basis if needed during AEF rotations or other periods of extended absence. If augmentee evaluators are utilized, they will not evaluate the area in which they are currently assigned to ensure conflicts of interest do not occur.

NOTE: The list must also include the area(s) they were assigned to evaluate. This can be done by maintaining all previous quality assurance appointment letters. Not applicable to ARC.

2.7.5. Convene quarterly, unit-level training/quality assurance review boards to assess unit performance and actions taken to analyze, correct, and improve aerial port processes.

2.7.5.1. Establish a written response policy for all evaluations with findings rated fail, TDV, DSV, or UCR.

2.7.5.2. If mandating additional evaluations above the minimum number required in this instruction, establish a written policy governing the required number of evaluations. (See paragraph **2.9.2.** for the command minimum evaluation requirement.).

2.7.6. Review metric and trend data on a monthly basis and/or as directed by HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.7.7. Ensure an annual self-inspection of the unit's ATSEV QA function is conducted and submitted to the HQ AMC ATSEV QA program manager. (See **Attachment 8**) (Not applicable to ARC units.)

2.7.7.1. Document review of the self-inspection, file and maintain it for 1-year.

2.7.7.2. If required submit in writing request for a waiver of any requirements of this publication to HQ AMC/A4TX for consideration.

2.7.8. Ensure evaluations are recorded and submitted to HQ AMC/A4TX NET the 3rd and NLT the 7th day the month utilizing the ATSEV QA database. If your database is not available, submit evaluations utilizing the ATSEV QA Manual Evaluations Report (**Attachment.6**).

2.7.9. Ensure that during unit deployment periods, the ATSEV QA program remains active and manned to ensure full compliance with this instruction.

2.7.10. Ensure seasoned transportation personnel are selected to serve as SMEs for both initial and revision levels of USAF EC/MOS/MOOT ISD.

2.8. **Contingency Response Wing Commanders will:**

2.8.1. Ensure prioritized training in accordance with (IAW) AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program.*

2.8.2. Establish a viable ATSEV QA function.

2.8.3. Designate, in writing (**Attachment 4**), ATSEV QA assigned personnel.

2.8.3.1. If deemed necessary, the appointment of a single ATSEV QA manager is authorized for the Contingency Response Wings (CRW). If used, and authorized to evaluate, the manager will be designated as both on the letter at **Attachment 4.**

2.8.3.1.1. If the manager is utilized within the CRW, close coordination must be maintained with each CRG commander for quality assurance requirements.

2.8.3.2. Assign evaluators within each unit as needed and list the area(s) authorized to evaluate on **Attachment 4.**

2.8.4. Establish a written policy governing the required number of evaluations during each deployment. (See paragraph **2.9.2.**)

2.8.5. Ensure evaluation results of personnel assisting the home unit are forwarded to the CRW/ CRG manager.

2.8.6. Ensure an annual self-inspection of the unit's ATSEV QA function is conducted and submitted to the HQ AMC ATSEV QA program manager.

2.8.7. Document the review of the self-inspection, file and maintain it for 1-year.

2.8.8. If required submit in writing request for a waiver of any requirements of this publication to HQ AMC/A4TX for consideration.

2.8.9. Ensure evaluations are recorded and submitted to HQ AMC/A4TX NET the 3rd and NLT the 7th day the month utilizing the ATSEV QA database. If your database is not available, submit evaluations utilizing the ATSEV QA Manual Evaluations Report (**Attachment 6**).

2.8.10. Establish a written response policy for all evaluations with findings rated fail, TDV, DSV, or UCR.

2.8.11. Ensure seasoned transportation personnel are selected to serve as SMEs for both initial and revision levels of USAF EC/MOS/MOOT ISD.

2.9. **Air Terminal Managers and/or Operations Officers will:**

(**Note: "TM"** used in this volume identifies terminal manager and/or operations officer requirements.)

2.9.1. Nominate to the commander the most qualified individuals to serve as ATSEV QA manager and evaluator(s).

2.9.2. Recommend the required number of monthly evaluations to the commander. The minimum number of monthly evaluations required is equal to 40 percent of "available" active duty, civilian, and ARC (except those on annual tour) personnel. When determining the required number of eval-

uations, remember the goal of the evaluation process is to ensure a thorough look at all processes within each section. As with any review, the greater number of evaluations completed will offer the unit a clearer picture and could improve HQ AMC inspection ratings. (See **Attachment 1**, Terms, "Available Personnel").

2.9.3. Review the Command Process Evaluation List (CPEL). Determine if any processes should be evaluated with greater frequency within the unit. (See paragraph **3.3.2.**) Note: If the number of critical tasks performed by the unit identified on the CPEL exceeds the minimum number of evaluations required in **2.9.2.**, the higher number is the minimum.

2.9.4. Ensure quarterly ATSEV QA and unit-level training review boards are conducted with the commander, the unit training manager (UTM), and other senior leaders as deemed necessary.

2.9.5. Ensure monthly metrics/trend data reviews are accomplished with the commander as a minimum to determine if the required CPEL items have been evaluated as required.

2.9.6. Ensure an annual self-inspection of the unit's ATSEV QA function is conducted and all findings are reported to the commander. TMs may task an individual outside the ATSEV QA office to accomplish this; however, it is of the utmost importance this person be extremely knowledgeable of the function they are inspecting.

2.9.7. Review all self-inspections and ATSEV QA evaluation findings receiving a fail, TDV, DSV, or UCR; ensure corrective actions are valid, accurate, and completed in a timely manner.

2.9.7.1. Based on findings, determine if additional evaluations are required in a specific area/ task.

2.9.8. Ensure seasoned transportation personnel are selected to serve as SMEs for both initial and revision levels of the USAF EC/MOS/MOOT ISD.

2.9.9. If required submit in writing request for a waiver of any requirements of this publication to HQ AMC/A4TX for consideration.

2.10. **ATSEV Quality Assurance (QA) will:**

2.10.1. The ATSEV QA staff will evaluate the quality of process performance in the organization and report directly to the commander.

2.10.2. ATSEV QA also perpetuates an environment where quality transportation, safety, equipment reliability, safety of flight, job proficiency and standardization remain at the core of all transportation processes.

2.10.3. ATSEV QA makes recommendations for improving effectiveness of all transportation processes and serves as the unit focal point for oversight of technical activities and process improvement initiatives.

2.11. **ATSEV QA Manager will:**

2.11.1. Be a non-commissioned officer (TSgt or above – or civilian equivalent) with a 2T271 AFSC. ARC may substitute a 3S2X1, Training Manager.

2.11.2. Manage the unit-level ATSEV QA Program.

2.11.3. Assist TM in nominating the most knowledgeable personnel within the unit to serve as quality assurance evaluators. Ensure personnel meet all requirements prior to being nominated to

the position. (**Note:** At the discretion of the TM/ATSEV QA Manager, ARC personnel filling home station evaluator positions may be used as evaluators at the deployed location. This note does not apply to ARC personnel completing annual tour training requirements.) Ensure ARC personnel are qualified and designated in writing by the ARC home unit commander.

2.11.4. Ensure the required number of process evaluations are conducted monthly and evaluation results are reported to each respective flight commander and superintendent, TM, and the commander.

2.11.4.1. Ensure equal numbers of evaluations (proportional to population) are conducted on each shift.

2.11.4.2. If your QA database is not available, ensure a tracking number is assigned to each evaluation. The suggested tracking procedure is to list by section, shift, and number, i.e., TRPS001. Broken down this would signify; TRP – as Passenger Services, S – as swing shift, and 001 – as the first evaluation of the month for that particular section/shift.

2.11.5. Track all evaluations rated fail, TDV, DSV, or UCR until resolved. Comply with the written response policy defined by the commander, to avoid overdue or overlooked replies. Inform unit leadership on all late replies and repeat findings.

2.11.6. Develop commander, and if required, HQ directed metrics, collect and analyze trend data, and maintain program files IAW paragraphs **2.11.6.2.** and **3.2.1.7.**

2.11.6.1. Ensure evaluations are recorded and submitted to HQ AMC/A4TX NET the 3rd and NLT the 7th day the month utilizing the ATSEV QA database. If your database is not available, submit evaluations utilizing the ATSEV QA Manual Evaluations Report (**Attachment 6**). Not applicable to ARC units.

2.11.6.2. Program files consist of: AMC Forms (IMT-V2) 1022, *Air Transportation Process Evaluation History*, AMC Forms (IMT-V1) 1026, *Process Evaluation Worksheet*, annual unit ATSEV QA self inspections, quarterly ATSEV QA board minutes and support material, documentation of ATII compliance, and the results of HQ inspections/SAVs. **Note:** Units may substitute AMC Form's 1022 and/or 1026 with locally produced forms, provided all information fields are duplicated. Active duty units utilizing the QA database are not required to maintain AMC Form 1022/1026.

2.11.7. Provide a monthly summary of evaluations to the unit commander.

2.11.8. Ensure ATIIs are reviewed, maintained and appropriate action(s) taken.

2.11.9. Ensure an annual unit ATSEV QA self-inspection IAW **Attachment 2** and **Attachment 8** of this instruction is conducted (**Attachment 3** for ARC units) and provide a written report to the TM for forwarding to the commander to review and endorse. Recommend the annual unit ATSEV QA self-inspection be documented using AF IMT 2519, *All Purpose Checklist*. All open items will be given an Estimated Closure Date (ECD) for tracking purposes. AFRC units will utilize their AFRC SE/QC checklist.

2.11.9.1. Active duty units will e-mail the commander approved report to HQ AMC/A4TX organizational mail box AMC/ATSEV. Units may scan and e-mail the endorsed report to HQ AMC/A4TX. Overseas units will courtesy copy their report to their respective AMOG. ARC units will maintain the results of their SE/QC checklist evaluation in their station file.

2.11.10. Ensure work center trainers use current QTP's from the HQ AMC/A4TX web page.

2.11.11. Ensure supervisors are knowledgeable of and are using Proficiency Assessments (PAs) to determine a previously QTP trained individuals knowledge level when required.

2.11.12. Ensure unit SME's review QTP's within the timeframe established by the HQ AMC ATSEV QA program manager. The results of the review must be consolidated and submitted by the unit ATSEV QA Manager.

2.11.13. Coordinate with the unit's reserve coordinator to obtain the current schedule of ARC training and augmentation.

2.11.14. Complete the Air Force Training Course (formerly known as "Train the Trainer Course").

2.11.15. Be well versed on the training requirements contained in AMCI 24-101, Volume 22.

2.11.16. The effectiveness of any formal training course can be directly attributed to the expertise of the individuals selected to serve as SMEs for the ISD. When requested to provide SMEs the ATSEV manager ensures seasoned transportation personnel are selected to serve as SMEs for both initial and revision levels of the USAF EC/MOS/MOOT ISD.

2.11.17. Conduct annual Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation (EPEs) on unit evaluators to ensure proficiency and standardization.

2.11.18. Ensure unit compliance with Command Performance Standards. The CPS will be utilized by ATSEV QA evaluators, trainers, and the LSEP inspection team to evaluate training and individual/team performance compliance with the standard.

2.11.19. Identify requirements of this publication that require HQ AMC ATSEV program manager consideration for a waiver.

2.12. **ATSEV QA Evaluators will:**

2.12.1. Be no less than a 5-skill level and QTP trained in all processes they evaluate.

2.12.2. Reflect the highest standards of military bearing and professionalism; be impartial, objective, and consistent in all evaluations.

2.12.3. Provide introductory and post-evaluation feedback to personnel, as appropriate to the evaluation.

2.12.3.1. Offer guidance/suggestions as needed during the post-evaluation feedback session.

2.12.3.2. Assign a tracking number to each evaluation IAW paragraph **2.11.4.2.** Note: Tracking numbers are not required by active duty units utilizing the ATSEV QA database.

2.12.4. Areas authorized to evaluate will be identified in the evaluator's Specialty Training Standard (STS) or documented in Reserve Aerial Port Data System (RAPDS). **Exception:** If the evaluator is a Senior NCO with an awarded 2T271 skill level, the evaluator appointment letter will serve as the STS qualification document. **NOTE:** Evaluators are also required to maintain any/all specialty training, i.e., Hazardous Materials, Joint Inspections, etc.

2.12.5. Complete the Air Force Training Course (formerly known as "Train the Trainer Course").

2.12.6. Be well versed on the training requirements contained in AMCI 24-101, Volume 22.

2.12.7. Enter evaluations into the ATSEV QA database. If using the manual methods, ensure completeness and accuracy before reporting.

2.12.8. Provide the units ATSEV QA Manager a review of QTP's as outlined by HQ AMC/A4TX.

2.13. **Work center trainers will:**

2.13.1. Meet all requirements listed in AFI 36-2201, AMCI 24-101, Vol. 22, and this instruction.

2.13.2. Plan, conduct, and document training using current QTP's.

2.13.3. Be QTP trained in the tasks/processes for which they train others.

2.13.4. Complete the Air Force Training Course (formerly known as "Train the Trainer Course").

2.13.5. Be well versed on the training requirements contained in AMCI 24-101, Volume 22.

2.13.6. Make recommendations to the unit ATSEV QA Manager for personnel to perform SME duties.

2.13.7. Provide the ATSEV QA Manager a review of QTP's as outlined by HQ AMC/A4TX.

3. **Program Guidance.**

3.1. Evaluations are AMC's formal avenue to ensure the effectiveness of air transportation processes and identify areas for improvement. They provide leadership with factual information about the health and effectiveness of the unit and training. Accurate assessments of personnel proficiency and processes are critical to gauging unit effectiveness. This program is intended to enhance cross-tell and facilitate benchmarking, while allowing latitude to adapt it for local needs.

3.1.1. Process evaluations are assessments of procedures required to accomplish the unit's mission. Every effort should be made to conduct personnel evaluations (PEs) of available personnel while they are performing their daily transportation duties without disruption of the normal work schedule. The focus is on efficient and effective completion of tasks and processes within command standards. Safety is inherent in all processes and an integral part of evaluations.

3.1.1.1. All personnel involved in performing the process are subject to evaluation. This includes senior NCOs, civilians, and ARC personnel. (A copy of the AMC Form (IMT-V1) 1026 (or automated equivalent) for all processes involving ARC personnel will be forwarded to the ARC Team Chief before departure.)

3.1.1.2. When conducting evaluations, ensure an equal number are accomplished (proportional to population) on each shift.

3.1.1.3. There are four categories of evaluation and three categories of observation: Evaluations are Personnel Evaluation (PE), Quality Verification Inspection (QVI), Special Inspection (SI), and Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation (EPE). Observations are Detected Safety Violation (DSV), Technical Data Violation (TDV), and Unsatisfactory Condition Report (UCR). Based on the Acceptable Quality Level (AQL) PEs QVIs, SIs and EPEs will be rated PASS/FAIL.

3.1.1.3.1. Personnel Evaluations (PE) are an over the shoulder evaluation of a specific individual or team of individuals while actually performing a task. The majority of unit evaluations will be PEs. The evaluator may start and/or stop the evaluation at any step in the task if a safety issue is discovered and further process completion could result in harm to an individual, an aircraft delay, and/or damage to equipment. Evaluations will accu-

rately assess the proficiency of each individual under evaluation. However, in the case of a team evaluation, the success or failure of the evaluation will be assessed against the task supervisor.

3.1.1.3.2. Quality Verification Inspections (QVI) are an after-the-fact assessment following a process or task to verify the proper completion of that action. QVI like PE, are attributable to a specific individual or team of individuals and will follow the same rules for assignment of a passed/failed inspection as those outlined for a PE as stated above. Because they are assigned to a specific individual or team of individuals, QVI will be conducted only when reasonable assurance can be obtained through personal observation or inference that the environment in which the task was originally completed has not been significantly altered.

3.1.1.3.3. Special Inspections (SI) are inspections not otherwise covered by QVI or PE. SI may include, but are not limited too, vehicle and equipment forms inspection, files, housekeeping, etc. Generally, individuals are not assigned responsibility in regards to an SI, because they are unknown or identification would be inappropriate.

3.1.1.3.4. Detected Safety Violations (DSV) are observations of an unsafe act committed by an individual not undergoing a PE at the time. The evaluator will stop the unsafe act immediately and notify the individual's supervisor.

3.1.1.3.5. Technical Data Violations (TDV) are observations of any person (not undergoing a PE at the time) performing a task without proper technical data available and/or in use. The evaluator will stop the task being performed immediately and notify the individual's supervisor.

3.1.1.3.6. Unsatisfactory Condition Reports (UCR) are an observed unsafe or unsatisfactory condition, other than a DSV, which cannot be assigned to a specific individual; however, it can be charged to a specific work center. Document these types of inspection discrepancies as a UCR rather than a DSV when it is not possible to determine who created the unsafe condition.

3.1.1.3.7. Evaluator Proficiency Evaluations (EPEs) of ATSEV QA evaluators will be conducted by a member of the APS LSEP Team designated by the APS Team Lead during the unit's LSEP inspection. EPEs can consist of an over-the-shoulder evaluation of an ATSEV QA evaluator conducting a PE, an evaluator being asked to accomplish the process themselves, and/or an after-the-fact follow-up of a QVI conducted by an ATSEV QA evaluator. Additionally, ATSEV QA personnel are subject to DSV and TDV observations.

3.1.1.4. Rating Criteria. Assign one of the following ratings to every process evaluation:

3.1.1.4.1. A pass rating indicates the process/task met or exceeded the acceptable standard.

3.1.1.4.2. A fail rating indicates the process/task did not meet minimum standards due to exceeding the minor finding AQL or identifying a major finding. A minor finding is an unsatisfactory condition that requires correction, but does not endanger personnel, affect safety of flight, jeopardize equipment reliability, or warrant discontinuing a process. AQL of minor findings is two, unless otherwise noted for that task. A major finding is an unsatisfactory condition that does not qualify as a minor finding. Conditions that would warrant

a DSV, TDV, or UCR rating during an observation are considered major findings and are rated as a fail during a PE.

3.1.1.4.3. A DSV/TDV rating indicates an ***OBSERVATION*** of a process/task that did not meet acceptable standards due to major findings in the areas of safety or technical data violations. A major finding is a condition that would endanger personnel, jeopardize equipment reliability, warrant discontinuing the process, or that could result in process failure. When a DSV/TDV condition is observed, correct it immediately. Under no circumstance will a safety or equipment reliability error go uncorrected. The evaluator will consider the seriousness of the error when deciding whether or not the member(s) performing the process and the evaluation itself should continue.

3.1.1.4.4. A UCR rating indicates the ***OBSERVATION*** of an unsafe or unsatisfactory condition and it is not possible to determine individual responsibility.

3.1.1.5. Suspense evaluations receiving a fail, DSV, TDV or UCR to the appropriate flight commander/superintendent for corrective action(s). All evaluations meeting this paragraph will be routed and returned to the ATSEV QA Manager within 5 duty days. Work centers will respond to all findings by stating the action taken to resolve the identified problem(s) to include an "implementation date or estimate closure date". Work center responses will be routed through the superintendent, flight commander, and TM before reaching the ATSEV section. Unit commanders will be briefed on open/closed items monthly.

3.1.1.6. Evaluators must review all individuals' OJT Records for vehicle evaluations receiving a fail, DSV or TDV to verify training documentation (i.e., have individuals been trained, etc.). Periodically review records of those rated pass (as time permits). Identify discrepancies in documentation to the unit training manager for follow-up action. At no time will the evaluation ratings be changed based on OJT Record documentation discrepancies alone.

3.1.1.7. Results of all evaluations will be recorded in the ATSEV QA database, or on an AMC Form (IMT-V2) 1022 (automated equivalent is authorized IAW **2.11.6.2.**). Note: Active duty units will file the completed forms by shift within each respective month and maintain them for two years. File maintenance can be done via hard copy or electronically in the ATSEV QA database. If done electronically, ensure routine backups are accomplished. Failure to provide data due to computer downtimes and/or problems will not be an acceptable reason during HQ AMC inspections. (Not applicable to ARC.) Note: Active duty units utilizing the ATSEV QA database are not required to maintain AMC Form 1022 unless the system was not working properly and manual forms had to be used.

3.1.1.8. All findings, whether they result in a PASS or FAIL evaluation and all observations, will include a reference to the technical order, instruction, and/or command standard violated, and every attempt will be made to ensure the validity of each finding prior to the determination to include that finding in the ATSEV QA database. Toward this end, units are encouraged to challenge the factual references (though not the evaluator's subjective interpretation) of any given finding. Evaluators will review evaluation results with the person(s)/supervisor evaluated upon completion of each evaluation, and welcome challenges to the factual determination of any given finding.

3.1.2. Command Process Evaluation List (CPEL). The CPEL is a command-directed list of critical and non-critical processes (basic) to be evaluated within an air transportation unit. Critical

tasks are those which should be assessed more often than other tasks. ATSEV QA in active duty AMC units must evaluate non-critical processes at least once every three months and critical processes monthly. See the HQ AMC/A4TX web site for the current CPEL. Note: The CPEL is the product of a collaborated effort within the HQ AMC A4T staff.

3.1.3. Command Performance Standard (CPS). The CPS is a command directed task compliance and/or performance checklist developed to clarify or establish standards for air transportation tasks not appropriate to include in a QTP, ATII or any volume of AMCI 24-101. The CPS also provides the staff an avenue to address policy shortfalls or A4T interpretation of guidance affecting the field. The CPS will be utilized by ATSEV QA evaluators, trainers, and the LSEP inspection team to evaluate training and individual/team performance compliance with the standard.

3.1.3.1. CPS may be developed by any AMC/A4T team member and submitted to the HQ AMC ATSEV QA Program Manager.

3.1.3.2. CPS are published and maintained by the HQ AMC ATSEV QA Program Manager, who will ensure each CPS is reviewed at least annually by its author for currency.

3.1.3.3. ATSEV QA evaluators will determine unit compliance with tasks/processes governed by a CPS during evaluations.

4. ARC Program Administration/Execution.

4.1. ARC unit commanders will ensure UTMs/ATSEV QA managers oversee and manage the training program. This program consists of duty position training, MHE training, process evaluations, and documentation.

4.2. HQ NGB/A4RD and AFRC/NAFs will review unit-level training programs for compliance utilizing ANG Program Checklist (**Attachment 3**) or the AFRC SE/QC checklist, as applicable.

4.3. Unit commanders will ensure all 2T2X1 personnel receive duty position QTP training as listed on their RAPDS JQS worksheets.

4.4. Unit commanders will ensure process evaluations are completed to demonstrate the level of squadron proficiency. This can be accomplished through simulated scenarios, performance assessment of equipment operations, and active duty evaluations.

4.5. Team chief will request training from active duty units by specific QTP number. Document request on the RAPDS-generated TR 14.

4.6. Team chiefs must obtain AMC Forms (IMT-V1) 1026 (or automated equivalent) on all personnel who take part in processes evaluated by active duty personnel. They must also ensure they receive TECs for all personnel trained by active duty personnel. The TECs will be used to update RAPDS.

5. AMC Program Administration/Execution.

5.1. Commanders are vital to a successful ATSEV QA program. They establish a separate duty section dedicated to the ATSEV quality assurance program. While additional duties may be assigned, they will not interfere with the management/evaluation requirements of the ATSEV QA program.

5.1.1. Suggested unit manning for the ATSEV QA office is based on the total number of assigned 2T2X1 personnel which includes the TM and personnel assigned to separate offices, i.e. CCX. Recommend 2 evaluators for a unit of 51 to 100, and an additional evaluator for each multiple of

50 thereafter. To reduce the impact on manning, the ATSEV QA manager may also be an evalua-tor. (**Note:** Commanders must ensure enough evaluators are assigned so all processes within the unit can be evaluated.)

   5.1.1.1. Commanders of small active duty units with 50 or less permanently assigned air trans-portation personnel (including civilian and foreign nationals) are authorized to assign ATSEV QA duties to unit trainers/supervisors. A full time ATSEV QA office and staff is not required; however, personnel are still required to train and perform to the QTP standard as directed by AMCI 24-101, Volume 22 and this instruction. To ensure sections are performing as required, unit commanders must ensure quarterly reviews are accomplished on all processes within each section to ensure compliance IAW directives. Commanders may task section leadership and/or personnel from other sections to perform the review; however personnel performing the review from outside the respective work center must be fully qualified in that respective work center before conducting the review. Small active duty units (described above) are not required to maintain and/or report findings via the ATSEV database; however, all quarterly reviews (to include any/all findings and ECDs) will be documented and reported to section leadership and the commander. All reports will be filed and maintained for two years. Units that are not required to maintain an ATSEV QA function under this instruction are still subject to LSEP inspection.

5.2. Evaluators represent a cross-section of aerial port personnel who are highly motivated with above-average communicative skills and a record of excellence in their specialty. To avoid potential conflicts of interest, evaluators will, whenever possible, be assigned to the ATSEV QA manager for reporting purposes.

   5.2.1. ATSEV QA evaluators will serve for a minimum of one year. Commanders should establish a rotation policy to ensure expertise flows in and out of the ATSEV office without disrupting con-tinuity. (**Note:** Remote (12 month) locations are not required to comply with the minimum requirement) Not applicable to ARC units.

6. Adopted and Prescribed Forms/IMT's.

   6.1. Adopted: AF IMT 2519**,** *All Purpose Checklist*

   6.2. Prescribed: AMC IMT 1022, *Air Transportation Process Evaluation History***;** AMC IMT 1026, *Process Evaluation Worksheet***.**

                              GRACE BLEVINS-HOLMAN, Col, USAF
                              Deputy Director of Logistics

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPORTING INFORMATION

References

AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program*

AMCI 20-1, *Logistics Standardization and Evaluation Program*

AMCI 24-101, Volume 22, *Training Requirements for Aerial Port Operations*

AFRCI 24-101, *Reserve Aerial Port Program*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Component

ANG—Air National Guard

AQL—Acceptable Quality Level

ARC—Air Reserve Component (Applies to both Reserve and Guard personnel)

ATII—Air Transportation Interest Item

CFETP—Career Field Education and Training Plan

CoP—Community of Practice

CPEL—Command Process Evaluation List

CPS—Command Performance Standard

DSV—Detected Safety Violation

EPE—Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation

ECD—Estimate Closure Date

ISD—Instructional Systems Design

LSEP—Logistics Standardization/Evaluation Program

NGB—National Guard Bureau

NLT—Not Later Than

NET—No Earlier Than

PA—Proficiency Assessment

PE—Personnel Evaluation

QA—Quality Assurance

QTP—Qualification Training Package

QVI—Quality Verification Inspection

RAPDS—Reserve Aerial Port Data System

SE/QC—Self-Evaluation/Quality Control

SI—Special Inspection

SME—Subject Matter Expert

STS—Specialty Training Standard

TA—Training Assessment

TDV—Technical Data Violation

TEC—Task Evaluation Checklist

TM—Terminal Management

TTG—Task Training Guide

UCR—Unsatisfactory Condition Report

USAF EC/MOS/MOOT—USAF Expeditionary Center/Mobility Operations School/Air Transportation Branch **-** Formally the AMWC

UTM—Unit Training Manager

WBT—Web Based Training

Terms

Air Transportation Interest Item (ATII)—A process that requires special attention based on current trend data. Much like an AMC/IG special interest item (SII), but applicable to air transportation processes addressed in the ATSEV program. HQ AMC/A4TX, HQ AFRC/A4T, and HQ NGB/A4RD are responsible for establishing and rescinding ATIIs.

AMC Distributed Learning Service (ADLS)—The official online learning system of Air Mobility Command.

Available Personnel—Available Personnel are those "on station" performing tasks - including augmenting forces. Personnel working at an alternate work site due to a runway closure are considered augmenting forces to the unit where the tasks are being performed. Individuals who are TDY of station or on convalescent leave will not be counted.

Command Process Evaluation List (CPEL)—AMCs command-directed list of processes to be evaluated within an air transportation unit. The list identifies basic and critical processes.

Critical Process—A process within air transportation that if not properly accomplished will cause severe mission degradation or failure.

Detected Safety Violation (DSV)—Observation(s) of an unsafe act committed by an individual not undergoing a PE at the time.

Evaluator—Air transportation personnel who perform evaluations as specified in this instruction.

Observation—Observations are Detected Safety Violation (DSV), Technical Data Violation (TDV), and Unsatisfactory Condition Report (UCR).

Proficiency Assessment (PA)—An assessment of the individuals' task knowledge/performance level.

Personnel Evaluation (PE)—An over the shoulder evaluation of a specific individual or team of individuals while actually performing a task.

Qualification Training Package (QTP)—An instructional package designed for use at the unit level to train and evaluate personnel in their duty position.

Quality Verification Inspection (QVI)—An after-the-fact assessment following a process or task to verify the proper completion of that action.

RAPDS—Air Staff approved automated data base training documentation program (used by the ARC) which replaced the STS portion of the CFETP.

Special Inspection (SI)—Inspections not otherwise covered by QVI or PE.

Subject Matter Expert (SME)—SMEs are individuals who have on-the-job experience working in or with the subject/task(s) being analyzed.

Technical Data Violation (TDV)—Observations of any person (not undergoing a PE at the time) performing a task without proper technical data available and/or in use.

Training Assessment (TA)—Assessment (test) of training conducted; prior to completing the TEC.

Unsatisfactory Condition Report (UCR)—An observed unsafe or unsatisfactory condition, other than a DSV, which cannot be assigned to a specific individual; however, it can be charged to a specific work center.

Attachment 2

ACTIVE APS AIR TRANSPORTATION STANDARDIZATION/EVALUATION (ATSEV) QUALITY ASSURANCE MANAGEMENT CHECKLIST (NOT APPLICABLE TO ARC)

ACTIVE APS ATSEV QA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CHECKLIST		Page 1 of 2 Pages		
	NOT APPLICABLE TO ARC	COA Aug 07		
No.		**Yes**	**No**	**N/A**
A2.1.1. Unit Commander Responsibilities:				
A2.1.1.1.	Has the commander established a unit-level ATSEV QA Program?			
A2.1.1.2.	Has the commander designated a Manager and evaluator(s) in writing?			
A2.1.1.3.	Do appointment letters indicate the primary area(s) the Manager/evaluators are assigned to evaluate?			
A2.1.1.4.	Does the commander review metrics and trend data at least monthly?			
A2.1.1.5.	Does the commander convene a program review board on a quarterly basis?			
A2.1.1.6.	Has the commander ensured an annual self-inspection of the program is conducted?			
A2.1.1.7.	Has the commander been briefed on the self-inspection results and initialed the report?			
A2.1.1.8.	If additional evaluations are required above Volume 20 guidance, has the commander established the required number of monthly evaluations?			
A2.1.1.9.	Has the commander ensured that any requirements of this volume that cannot be met have been addressed to HQ AMC/A4TX ATSEV QA PM?			
A2.1.2. Air Terminal Manager/Operations Officer (TM) Responsibilities:				
A2.1.2.1.	Has the TM coordinated with the Manager to nominate the most knowledgeable personnel within the unit to serve as evaluators?			
A2.1.2.2.	Does the TM ensure the required number of monthly evaluations are accomplished?			
A2.1.2.3.	Does the TM ensure quarterly, unit-level training/ATSEV QA review boards are conducted with the commander and other senior leaders as deemed necessary?			
A2.1.2.4.	Does the TM ensure monthly metrics/trend data reviews are accomplished with the commander as a minimum?			
A2.1.2.5.	Does the TM ensure an annual self-inspection of the unit's Program is conducted and all findings are reported to the commander?			
A2.1.2.6.	Does the TM review all self-inspection reports and evaluation findings resulting in a Fail, DSV, TDV or UCR rating to ensure all corrective actions are valid and completed in a timely manner?			
A2.1.3. ATSEV QA Manager Responsibilities:				
A2.1.3.1.	Is the Manager a noncommissioned officer (TSgt or above -- or civilian equivalent) with a 2T271 AFSC and well versed in air transportation operations?			
A2.1.3.2.	Does the Manager ensure process evaluations are conducted with results reported to unit and flight commanders?			

No.		Yes	No	N/A
A2.1.3.3.	If not using the ATSEV QA database, does the Manager ensure all evaluations are given a tracking number?			
A2.1.3.4.	If used, does the Manager ensure all evaluations are entered into the ATSEV QA database?			
A2.1.3.5.	Does the Manager track open items until resolved?			
A2.1.3.6.	Has the Manager completed required metrics?			
A2.1.3.7.	Does the Manager report trends and summaries of evaluations to the unit commander on at least a monthly basis, as required?			
A2.1.3.8.	Does the Manager ensure ATIIs are reviewed and appropriate action(s) taken?			
A2.1.3.9.	Does the Manager ensure an annual unit ATSEV self-inspection is accomplished?			
A2.1.3.10.	Does the QA Manager ensure work center trainers are using current QTP's?			
A2.1.3.11.	Has the Manager evaluated unit evaluators?			
A2.1.3.12.	Has the Manager completed the Air Force Training Course?			
A2.1.3.13.	Has the Manager ensured that any requirements of this volume that cannot be met have been identified to the Commander and addressed to HQ AMC/ A4TX ATSEV QA PM?			

ACTIVE APS ATSEV QA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CHECKLIST		Page 2 of 2 Pages		
	NOT APPLICABLE TO ARC	COA Aug 07		
No.		**Yes**	**No**	**N/A**
A2.1.4. ATSEV QA Evaluator Responsibilities:				
A2.1.4.1.	Do Evaluators hold a 5-skill level (or civilian equivalent) and are well versed in the processes being evaluated?			
A2.1.4.2.	Do Evaluators perform process evaluations?			
A2.1.4.3.	Do Evaluators provide pre-introduction and post-evaluation feedback to personnel receiving evaluations?			
A2.1.4.4.	Are Evaluators QTP trained in areas they evaluate? (To include recurring training)			
A2.1.4.5.	Have Evaluators completed the Air Force Training Course?			
A2.1.5. Work Center Trainer Responsibilities:				
A2.1.5.1.	Do work center trainers plan, conduct, and document training using current QTP's?			
A2.1.5.2.	Are work center trainers QTP trained in the tasks/ processes for which they train others?			
A2.1.6. Program Management/ Guidance:				
A2.1.6.1.	Are QTP's being used for all duty position qualification training?			
A2.1.6.2.	Are ratings being assigned to process evaluations IAW this instruction?			
A2.1.6.3.	Are basic processes identified on the CPEL evaluated at least once every three months?			
A2.1.6.4.	Are critical processes identified on the CPEL evaluated at least once each month?			
A2.1.6.5.	Do Evaluators review all individual OJT records for evaluations receiving a fail, DSV, or TDV rating to verify training documentation?			
A2.1.6.6.	Have documentation discrepancies found in OJT records been referred to the unit training manager for follow-up action?			
A2.1.6.7.	Were copies of all AMC Form 1026 (or electronic equivalent) for process evaluations involving ARC personnel provided to the appropriate ARC unit Team Chief before their departure?			
A2.1.7. Unit Program Execution:				
A2.1.7.1.	Has the unit commander established an ATSEV QA duty section dedicated solely to the program?			

No.		Yes	No	N/A
A2.1.7.2.	Are evaluators assigned additional duties that interfere with or degrade the evaluators ability to perform ATSEV QA duties? (Note: A yes answer here will require action)			
A2.1.7.3.	Are evaluators rotated regularly, serving no less than 1 year? (Exception: Remote units)			
A2.1.7.4.	During any unit deployment, is the ATSEV QA office constantly manned with experienced QA evaluators, and are they listed on the appointment letter?			
A2.1.7.5.	Are ATSEV QA position rotations accomplished without disrupting the program?			
A2.1.7.6.	Is a current copy of the last ATSEV QA unit self-inspection report on file?			
A2.1.7.7.	Are appropriate military/civilian training records maintained for all evaluators (TSgt and below)?			
A2.1.7.8.	Are the minimum number of required evaluations conducted each month?			
A2.1.7.9.	If not using the ATSEV database, are program files properly maintained, filed by month, and kept on file for two years?			
A2.1.7.10.	If using the ATSEV database, are program files properly maintained and kept for two years?			

Attachment 3

ARC AIR TRANSPORTATION STANDARDIZATION/EVALUATION (ATSEV) QUALITY ASSURANCE MANAGEMENT CHECKLIST

No.	ARC ATSEV QA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CHECKLIST			
	NOT APPLICABLE TO ACTIVE DUTY	COA Aug 07		
		Yes	No	N/A
A3.1.1. Unit Commander Responsibilities:				
A3.1.1.1.	Has the unit commander established a unit-level ATSEV QA Program utilizing QTPs?			
A3.1.1.2.	Has the unit commander appointed a Manager and evaluator(s) in writing?			
A3.1.1.3.	Ensure applicable ANG ATIIs are reviewed for compliance.			
A3.1.1.4.	Does unit commander review the program on a quarterly basis?			
A3.1.2. Unit ATSEV QA Manager Responsibilities:				
A3.1.2.1.	Is the Manager a noncommissioned officer (civilian equivalent) with a 2T271 AFSC or 3S2X1?			
A3.1.2.2.	Does the Manager ensure evaluations are conducted and results reported to unit/flight commanders?			
A3.1.2.3.	Does the Manager track open items until resolved?			
A3.1.2.4.	Does the Manager maintain program files for a period of two years?			
A3.1.2.5.	Does the Manager ensure work center trainers are using current QTPs?			
A3.1.3. ATSEV QA Evaluator Responsibilities:				
A3.1.3.1.	Do evaluators possess a minimum 2T251 AFSC?			
A3.1.3.2.	Do evaluators perform process evaluations?			
A3.1.3.3.	Do evaluators provide pre-evaluation and post-evaluation feedback to personnel receiving evaluations?			
A3.1.3.4.	Do evaluators immediately correct safety deficiencies during evaluations?			
A3.1.3.5.	Are evaluators QTP trained in areas they evaluate? (To include recurring training)			
A3.1.4. Work Center Trainer Responsibilities:				
A3.1.4.1.	Does the trainer stay qualified on the tasks for which the trainer trains others?			
A3.1.4.2.	Does the trainer conduct training using applicable QTPs?			
A3.1.5. Program Management:				
A3.1.5.1.	Are QTPs being used for all duty position qualification training?			
A3.1.5.2.	Are trainers QTP trained in areas identified as trainers?			
A3.1.5.3.	Do evaluators review all individual OJT records for evaluations receiving a fail, DSV, or TDV rating to verify training documentation?			
A3.1.6. Unit Program Execution:				
A3.1.6.1.	Is there a current copy of the last unit self-inspection report on file?			

Attachment 4

**SAMPLE AIR TRANSPORTATION STANDARDIZATION/EVALUATION (ATSEV) QUALITY
ASSURANCE PROGRAM LETTER**

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR MOBILITY COMMAND

Date

MEMORANDUM FOR HQ AMC/A4TR

FROM:

SUBJECT: Air Transportation Standardization/Evaluation (ATSEV) Quality Assurance
Program

1. The following individuals are designated as ATSEV/QA Program Manager/Evaluators for the
Unit, Base, Location:

RANK / NAME	POSITION	DSN PHONE #
MSgt	Program Manager	779-2540
TSgt	Evaluator	779-2951

2. In accordance with AMCI 24-101, Volume 20, listed below are the areas each individual is
qualified to perform evaluations in:

RANK / NAME	AREAS
MSgt	Air Terminal Operations/QAE
TSgt	Aircraft Services/Air Cargo

(STS Task numbers can be used, i.e., 12/13/14/19)

3. This supersedes all previously issued memorandums of the same subject.

NAME, RANK, USAF
Commander

cy: HQ AMC/A4TR Attn: ATSEV Program Manager
cc: Individual

Attachment 5

SAMPLE COMMAND PERFORMANCE STANDARD

HQ AMC A4T Command Performance Standard				
Required Performance	**Performance Standard**	**Acceptable Quality Level maximum allowable degree of deviation from requirements before rated a Fail.**	**QA Surveillance Method**	**Corrective Actions**
Position and secure a single 463L pallet onto a 60K Aircraft Loader.	Position and secure a single 463L pallet onto a 60K Aircraft Loader without damages and within the AQL.	100% Compliance	Random Observation	Direct, Immediate Corrective Action

SAMPLE

Attachment 6

AIR TRANSPORTATION STANDARDIZATION/EVALUATION (ATSEV) QUALITY ASSURANCE MANUAL EVALUATION REPORTS

ATSEV QA MANUAL MONTHLY EVALUATION REPORT

UNIT: _____   **MONTH/YEAR:** _____

NUMBER OF AVAILABLE MILITARY 2T2's: [   ]

NUMBER OF AVAILABLE CIVILIAN 2T2's: [   ]

TOTAL NUMBER OF 2T2's AVAILABLE: [   ]

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS REQUIRED: [   ]

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS COMPLETED: [   ]

TOTAL NUMBER OF MONTHLY PASS :   [   ]

TOTAL NUMBER OF MONTHLY FAILS: [   ]
  See NOTE Below

TOTAL NUMBER OF ON-STATION EVALUATIONS:	
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFF STATION EVALUATIONS:	

NOTE: All Evaluations are rated PASS or FAIL. Fail results must be detailed on the Failures Tab. Each ATSEV QA Manager (UPM) is responsible to ensure this report is accomplished in its entirety and sent to HQ AMC/A4TX no later than the 5th of each month. Negative reports are required. File this and all continuation sheets IAW AMCI 24-101, Volume 20 and maintain for two years.

COA: Aug 07   Page 1 of 3

ATSEV QA MANUAL FAILURE REPORT

UNIT: _____   **MONTH/YEAR:** _____

INPUTS

DATE: _____   **TASK**
                              AREA: _____

FINDING(s): _____

DATE: _____   **TASK**
                              AREA: _____

FINDING(s): _____

DATE: _____   **TASK**
                              AREA: _____

FINDING(s): _____

DATE: _____   **TASK**
                              AREA: _____

FINDING(s): _____

DATE: _____	**TASK AREA:** _____	
FINDING(s): _____		
DATE: _____	**TASK AREA:** _____	
FINDING(s): _____		
DATE: _____	**TASK AREA:** _____	
FINDING(s): _____		
	COA: Aug 07	Page 2 of 3

ATSEV QA MANUAL OBSERVATIONS REPORT

UNIT: **MONTH/YEAR:**

INPUTS

DATE: **TASK AREA:**

Type and Details:

DATE: **TASK AREA:**

Type and Details:

DATE: **TASK AREA:**

Type and Details:

DATE: **TASK AREA:**

Type and Details:

DATE:	**TASK AREA:**	
Type and Details:		
DATE:	**TASK AREA:**	
Type and Details:		
DATE:	**TASK AREA:**	
Type and Details:		
	COA: Aug 07	Page 3 of 3

Attachment 7

CRW ATSEV QA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CHECKLIST

CRW ATSEV QA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CHECKLIST		Page 1 of 2 Pages		
	NOT APPLICABLE TO ARC	COA Aug 07		
No.		**Yes**	**No**	**N/A**
A7.1.1. Unit Commander Responsibilities:				
A7.1.1.1.	Has the commander established a unit-level Program?			
A7.1.1.2.	Has the commander designated Manager and evaluator(s) in writing?			
A7.1.1.3.	Do appointment letters indicate the primary area(s) the Manager/evaluators are assigned to evaluate?			
A7.1.1.4.	Does the commander review metrics and trend data at least monthly?			
A7.1.1.5.	Does the commander convene an program review board on a quarterly basis?			
A7.1.1.6.	Has the commander ensured an annual self-inspection of the Program is conducted?			
A7.1.1.7.	Has the commander been briefed on the self-inspection results and initialed the report?			
A7.1.1.8.	If additional evaluations are required above Volume 20 guidance, has the commander established the required number of monthly evaluations?			
A7.1.1.8.	Has the commander ensured that any requirements of this volume that cannot be met have been addressed to HQ AMC/A4TX ATSEV QA PM?			
A7.1.2. Air Terminal Manager/Operations Officer (TM) Responsibilities:				
A7.1.2.1.	Has the TM coordinated with the Manager to nominate the most knowledgeable personnel within the unit to serve as evaluators?			N/A
A7.1.2.2.	Does the TM ensure the required number of monthly evaluations are accomplished?			N/A
A7.1.2.3.	Does the TM ensure quarterly, unit-level training/ATSEV QA review boards are conducted with the commander and other senior leaders as deemed necessary?			N/A
A7.1.2.4.	Does the TM ensure monthly metrics/trend data reviews are accomplished with the commander as a minimum?			N/A
A7.1.2.5.	Does the TM ensure an annual self-inspection of the unit's Program is conducted and all findings are reported to the commander?			N/A
A7.1.2.6.	Does the TM review all self-inspection reports and evaluation findings resulting in a Fail, DSV, TDV or UCR rating to ensure all corrective actions are valid and completed in a timely manner?			N/A
A7.1.3. ATSEV QA Manager Responsibilities:				
A7.1.3.1.	Is the Manager a noncommissioned officer (TSgt or above -- or civilian equivalent) with a 2T271 AFSC and well versed in air transportation operations?			
A7.1.3.2.	Does the Manager ensure process evaluations are conducted with results reported to unit and flight commanders?			

No.		Yes	No	N/A
A7.1.3.3.	If not using the ATSEV QA database, does the Manager ensure all evaluations are given a tracking number?			N/A
A7.1.3.4.	If used, does the Manager ensure all evaluations are entered into the QA database?			
A7.1.3.5.	Does the Manager track open items until resolved?			
A7.1.3.6.	Has the Manager completed required metrics?			
A7.1.3.7.	Does the Manager report trends and summaries of evaluations to the unit commander on at least a monthly basis, as required?			
A7.1.3.8.	Does the Manager ensure ATIIs are reviewed and appropriate action(s) taken?			
A7.1.3.9.	Does the Manager ensure an annual unit ATSEV self-inspection is accomplished?			
A7.1.3.10.	Does the Manager ensure work center trainers are using current QTP's?			
A7.1.3.11.	Has the Manager evaluated unit evaluators?			
A7.1.3.12.	Has the Manager completed the Air Force Training Course?			
A7.1.3.13.	Has the Manager ensured that any requirements of this volume that cannot be met have been identified to the Commander and addressed to HQ AMC/ A4TX ATSEV QA PM?			

CRW ATSEV QA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CHECKLIST		Page 2 of 2 Pages		
	NOT APPLICABLE TO ARC	COA Aug 07		
No.		Yes	No	N/A
A7.1.4. ATSEV QA Evaluator Responsibilities:				
A7.1.4.1.	Do evaluators hold a 5-skill level (or civilian equivalent) and well versed in the processes evaluating?			
A7.1.4.2.	Do evaluators perform process evaluations?			
A7.1.4.3.	Do evaluators provide pre-introduction and post-evaluation feedback to personnel receiving evaluations?			
A7.1.4.4.	Are evaluators QTP trained in areas they evaluate? (To include recurring training)			
A7.1.4.5.	Have evaluators completed the Air Force Training Course?			
A7.1.5. Work Center Trainer Responsibilities:				
A7.1.5.1.	Do work center trainers plan, conduct, and document training using current QTP's?			
A7.1.5.2.	Are work center trainers QTP trained in the tasks/processes for which they train others?			
A7.1.6. Program Management/ Guidance:				
A7.1.6.1.	Are QTP's being used for all duty position qualification training?			
A7.1.6.2.	Are ratings being assigned to process evaluations IAW this instruction?			
A7.1.6.3.	Are basic processes identified on the CPEL evaluated at least once every three months?			
A7.1.6.4.	Are critical processes identified on the CPEL evaluated at least once each month?			
A7.1.6.5.	Do evaluators review all individual OJT records for evaluations receiving a fail, DSV, or TDV rating to verify training documentation?			
A7.1.6.6.	Have documentation discrepancies found in OJT records been referred to the unit training manager for follow-up action?			
A7.1.6.7.	Were copies of all AMC Form 1026 (or electronic equivalent) for process evaluations involving ARC personnel provided to the appropriate ARC unit Team Chief before their departure?			N/A
A7.1.7. Unit Program Execution:				

No.		Yes	No	N/A
A7.1.7.1.	Has the unit commander established a separate duty section dedicated solely to the ATSEV QA program?			
A7.1.7.2.	Are evaluators assigned additional duties that take away from performing program duties? (Note: A yes answer here will require action)			N/A
A7.1.7.3.	Are evaluators rotated regularly, serving no less than 1 year? (Exception: Remote units)			N/A
A7.1.7.4.	During any unit deployment, is the program office constantly manned with experienced evaluators, and are they listed on the appointment letter?			
A7.1.7.5.	Are ATSEV QA position rotations accomplished without disrupting the program?			
A7.1.7.6.	Is a current copy of the last unit self-inspection report on file?			
A7.1.7.7.	Are appropriate military/civilian training records maintained for all evaluators (TSgt and below)?			
A7.1.7.8.	Are the minimum number of required evaluations conducted each month?			
A7.1.7.9.	If not using the ATSEV database, are program files properly maintained, filed by month, and kept on file for two years?			
A7.1.7.10.	If using the ATSEV database, are program files properly maintained and kept for two years?			

Attachment 8

AIR TRANSPORTATION STANDARDIZATION EVALUATION SELF-INSPECTION SUMMARY

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS 62D AIRLIFT WING (AMC)
McCHORD AIR FORCE BASE WASHINGTON

18 January 2007

MEMORANDUM FOR HQ AMC/A43R

FROM: 62 APS/CC
1422 Union Avenue
McChord AFB WA 98438

SUBJECT: Air Transportation Standardization/Evaluation Self-Inspection Summary.

1. The 62d Aerial Port Squadron conducted its annual ATSEV self-inspection in January 2007, IAW AMCI 24-101, Volume 20.

2. Only one open item exists that requires HQ AMC/A4TR/ATSEV notification.

   a. Checklist item A2.1.7.1.2. Are evaluators assigned additional duties that take away from performing ATSEV duties? Yes. All 62 APS ATSEV personnel are assigned to the 62 AW Exercise Evaluation Team. All evaluators are assigned unit self-inspection monitor duties. Three of the four evaluators are available 14 months between AEF rotations. Two evaluators are appointed as Wood Packaging Material site auditors. One evaluator is appointed as the alternate unit facility manager and the primary building facility manager.

3. If you have any questions, please contact 62 APS ATSEV Quality Assurance Manager, Mr. David Jeska, at (253) 982-1879.

// SIGNED //
RYAN M. COYNE, Major, USAF
Commander